

Yw



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,425	01/03/2002	Kent Blossom	FIS9-2001-0301US1	8937

28211 7590 05/03/2005
 FREDERICK W. GIBB, III
 MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC
 2568-A RIVA ROAD
 SUITE 304
 ANNAPOLIS, MD 21401

EXAMINER

ZEWDU, MELESS NMN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2683

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/037,425

Applicant(s)

BLOSSOM ET AL.

Examiner

Meless N Zewdu

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 March 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the communication filed on 12/21/04.
2. Claims 1-21 are pending in this action.
3. This action is final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 8, 12, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In this instance, the feature "wherein said central processing unit is adapted to add additional hierarchy to said first addressing scheme and said second addressing scheme to provide communication between users in said first agency and users in said second agency, without changing said first addressing scheme or said second addressing scheme" recited in claims 1, 8 and 17; and the feature "wherein said altering process adds additional hierarchy to said

Art Unit: 2683

first addressing scheme and said second addressing scheme to provide communication between users in said first agency and users in said second agency, without changing said first addressing scheme or second addressing scheme" recited in claim 12 do not have adequate support in the specification. In fact, rather on the contrary, the specification supports "the central processing unit changes an address of a message received from the first agency into a format acceptable to the second agency, and forwards the message to the second agency" (see summary, paragraphs 0007-0012, particularly paragraphs 0010).

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 8, 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In this instance, the claims are indefinite because they recite features that were not adequately or clearly described in the specification. For examination purpose, examiner interprets the feature in question as a global directory used for address format translation for exchanging messages between sending and receiving parties, as provided in the disclosure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art (APA) in views of Salazar (US 6,073,141) and Brown (US 6,014,711).

As per claim 1: a regional message server of a communication system, said regional message server comprising:

a first connection for connecting to a first agency, wherein said first agency communicates under a first addressing scheme reads on 'APA (see figs. 1A and 1B). Assume agency "A" (element 122) is the first agency, an address scheme would have been inherent to this agency so as to communicate with the end agencies, like with element 94.

a second connection for connecting to a second agency, wherein said second agency communicates under a second addressing scheme reads on 'APA (see figs. 1A and 1B). Assuming agency "B" (element 127) is the second agency, an address scheme would have been inherent to this agency so as to communicate with the end agencies, like with element 408. But, the APA does not explicitly teach about a global directory having a first and second connection, as claimed by applicant. However, in a related

Art Unit: 2683

field of endeavor, Salazar teaches about a computer system comprising a global directory (a master data base) that stores a master set of a plurality of records and a plurality of terminals in communication with the master database, wherein the global directory includes at least a first and second connections via which it is connected to respectively a first and second (regional) servers (see fig. 1, element 200; col. 1, line 64-col. 2, line 30; col. 2, line 66-col. 3, line 19; col. 4, lines 24-38). Note: the prior art teaches that the central database (the global directory) may be, for example, "the Worldwide Defense Messaging System Directory (also known as the X-500). Attached systems access and retrieve information from the central database and store it in a local cache. Periodically, information in the central database is updated with current information." (see col. 1, lines 12-41). When the central database/global directory is attached to the APA, the directory system will have a first and a second connections to respectively be connected/attached to the first and second agencies of the APA. Also, the directory and server system of the Salazar reference is a computer system (see abstract), it is obvious that it includes a central processing unit. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Salazar's global directory/server system to the APA for the advantage of exchanging and updating global message data, as taught by Salazar. But, the APA in view of Salazar does not explicitly teach about changing a first addressing scheme to a second addressing scheme. However, in a related field of endeavor, Brown teaches about apparatus and method for providing electronic mail relay translation service, wherein a global directory or (LDAP) extracts a unique address of a recipient of an

Art Unit: 2683

electronic message from a received voice message created by an originator (see fig. 2, elements 40, 10, 34 and 36; Abstract; col. 2, line 8-col. 3, line 38). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the APA with the teaching of Brown for the advantage of decreasing message processing time (see col. 3, lines 32-38). A central processing unit for address change/translation would have been obvious from the fact that address translation is made.

As per claim 2: the regional message server, wherein said first connection connects to a first message switching unit in said first agency and said second connection connects to a second message switching unit in said second agency reads on '141 (see fig. 1, elements 200, and 300). When the references are combined as shown above, the plurality of servers 300 will become regional servers serving the APA's first and second agencies via a first and second connections.

As per claim 3: the regional message server in claim 1, further comprising a translator, wherein said first agency and said second agency operate under different addressing protocols and said translator translates between said different addressing protocols reads on '711 (see fig. 2, element 10; col. 3, lines 10-38; col. 4, lines 4-46).

As per claim 4: the regional message server, wherein said global directory maintains addresses of units within said first agency and said second agency reads on '141 (see col. 3, lines 1-19; col. 4, lines 24-38).

As per claim 5: the regional server in claim 1, wherein said central processing unit changes an address of a message received from said first agency into a format

Art Unit: 2683

acceptable to said second agency and forwards said message to said second agency reads on '711 (see fig. 2, element 10; col. 3, lines 10-38; col. 4, lines 4-46). The central processing unit would have been obvious from the fact that a first message format is changed into a second message format.

As per claim 6: the regional message server, wherein said first and second agency are provided access to said global directory to obtain addresses of units within said global directory reads on '141 (see col. col. 3, lines 1-19; col. 4, lines 24-38).

As per claim 7: the regional message server in claim 1, wherein said central processing unit produces a report of active units in said first agency and said second agency reads on '711 (see col. 2, lines 8-18). A unique identifier can represent an active unit.

Claims 8-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in views of Solazar and Brown and further in view of Kitamura et al. (Kitamura) (US 6,247,012 B1).

As per claim 8: most of the features of claim 8 are similar to the features of claim 1. Hence, the similar features of claim 8 are rejected on the same ground and motivation as claim 1. But, the above references applied to claim 1 do not explicitly teach about a plurality of first level regional servers, each connected to a first agency and a second agency and a second level regional server connected to a plurality of said first-level regional servers, as claimed by applicant. However, in a related field of endeavor, Kitamura teaches about Information reception and delivery system suing global and local directory tables in an internet, wherein a plurality of high-level (first-level) servers

Art Unit: 2683

are connected to low level (second-level) servers which in turn are connected to clients/agencies (see figs. 3 and 4; col. 8, lines 31-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above references with the teaching of Kitamura for the advantage of providing clients/agencies with internal (e.g. regional) and external (e.g. outside a region) information/services.

As per claim 9: some of the features of claim 9 are similar to the features of claim 8. Hence, the similar features of claim 9 are rejected on the same ground and motivation as claim 8. The difference features are provided as shown below.

a directory of regional servers reads on '141 (see col. 1, line 62-col. 2, line 4).

a central processing unit reads on '141 (see abstract). Since, the directory/server system of the Salazar reference is a computer system, it is obvious that it includes a central processing unit.

As per claim 10: the communication system, wherein said directory of regional servers maintains addresses of all regional servers serviced by said communication system reads on '141 (see fig. 1; col. 1, line 62-col. 4, line 4).

As per claim 11: the communication system, wherein said central processing unit forwards said message from one first-level regional server to one or more second-level regional servers reads on '141 (see abstract; col. 1, lines 12-41).

As per claim 12: the features of claim 12 are similar to the features of claim 8. Hence, claim 12 is rejected on the same ground and motivation as claim 12. Furthermore, since claim 12 is directed to method steps to be followed by the apparatus of claim 8, claim 12

Art Unit: 2683

would be required by the apparatus of claim 8 as to be able to perform its function as claimed.

As per claim 13: the feature of claim 13 is similar to the feature of claim 3. Hence, claim 13 is rejected on the same ground and motivation as claim 3.

As per claim 14: the feature of claim 14 is similar to the feature of claim 6. Hence, claim 14 is rejected on the same ground and motivation as claim 6.

As per claim 15: the method further comprising providing said first agency and said second agency access to said global directory to obtain address of units within said global directory reads on '141 (see col. 1, line 57-col. 2, line 16, col. 2, line 66-col. 3, line 19; col. 4, lines 24-38).

As per claim 16: the method further comprising providing said first agency and said second agency access to said global directory reads on '141 (see col. 2, line 66-col. 3, line 19). The motivation is same as provided in the rejection of claim 8.

As per claim 17: the features of claim 17 are similar to the features of claim 8. Hence, claim 17 is rejected on the same ground and motivation as claim 8. Furthermore, since claim 17 is directed to method steps to be followed by the apparatus of claim 8, claim 17 would be required by the apparatus of claim 8 so as to be able to perform its function as claimed.

As per claim 18: the feature of claim 18 is similar to the feature of claim 3. Hence, claim 18 is rejected on the same ground and motivation as claim 3.

As per claim 19: the method further comprising a global directory having address of units within said first agency and said second agency reads on '141 (see col. 1, line 57-

Art Unit: 2683

col. 2, line 16, col. 2, line 66-col. 3, line 19; col. 4, lines 24-38). The motivation is same as provided in the rejection of claim 8.

As per claim 20: the method further comprising providing said first agency and said second agency access to said global directory to obtain address of units within said global directory reads on '141 (see col. 1, line 57-col. 2, line 16, col. 2, line 66-col. 3, line 19; col. 4, lines 24-38). The motivation is same as provided in the rejection of claim 8.

As per claim 21: the feature of claim 21 is similar to the feature of claim 7. Hence, claim 21 is rejected on the same ground and motivation as claim 7.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2683

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Meless N Zewdu whose telephone number is (571) 272-7873. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am to 5:00 pm..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on (571) 272-7872. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Meless Zewdu

M. Z.

Examiner

22 April 2005.



WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600